DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 127 016 PS 008 711

AUTHOR Goldberg, Milton
TITLE Follow Through in Philadelphia.
PUB DATE Apr 73
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Brookings Institution Panel on Social Experimentation Conference on Planned Variation Techniques (April 30 - May 1, 1973)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Resources; *Compensatory Education Programs; Curriculum Development; Demonstration Programs; *Disadvantaged Youth; *Early Childhood Education; *Elementary School Curriculum; Kindergarten; Kindergarten Children; Parent Participation; Parent School Relationship; Preschool Education; *Program Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS Pennsylvania (Philadelphia); *Project Follow Through; *Project Head Start

ABSTRACT

This report discusses Philadelphia's Follow Through program placing the project in its historical context. Growing out of the curriculum reform movement of the fifties and sixties, as well as Project Head Start and the War on Poverty, the Follow Through program was an attempt to maintain and reinforce the gains made by low-income children in preschool programs, and to implement on a nationwide scale effective exemplary approaches to the education and development of young children. The Philadelphia Follow Through program began in 1968 with 1343 kindergarten pupils in 16 Philadelphia schools. Seven early childhood education models were used. Changes or modifications brought about by the program (in teacher aide hiring practices, curriculum, administrative support areas, professional roles and use of community agencies and resources) are discussed. Parent participation and community involvement were found to play a major role in all aspects of the program. Limitations of the project are discussed, and it is concluded that while Follow Through has had many positive effects, there are still areas in need of improvement. (MS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Rothenberg
PS 7176

ED127016

FOLLOW THROUGH IN PHILADELPHIA

by

Milton Goldberg

PS 008711

Brookings Institution Panel on Social Experimentation
Conference on Planned Variation Techniques

April 30 - May 1, 1973

The inception of Follow Through and particularly the planned variation aspect of Follow Through represented the culmination of certain influences in American education which were in development during the 1950's and 1960's. It is important to describe these forces which were already reflected in a variety of elementary school programs and practices prior to Follow Through in order to fully understand the impact of this major educational effort on a school system.

Curriculum Reform

The curriculum reformers of the 1950's and 1960's were mainly university teachers of mathematics and the physical and social sciences. These expert representatives of their disciplines proposed and directed curriculum revision for both elementary and secondary schools based on the structures of the disciplines. This emphasis on the traditional school subjects sought to effect change in both the content and methods of instruction by identifying key ideas, concepts, and inquiry procedures essential to the subject. Broudy (1954) listed the critical discipline elements for consideration as follows:

(1) basic entities or units; e.g., events in history

(2) relationships among the entities or units; e.g., historical chronology

(3) other established, accepted data

(4) hypotheses developed to account for facts not yet established

(5) hypotheses already accepted by scholars

Further work by Bruner (1960), Foshay (1961), Heath (1964), Phenix (1964), etc., supported and enhanced the argument that curriculum built on the structure of the disciplines would help provide learners with both fundamental knowledge and the techniques for extending knowledge.

The results of these efforts were soon evident in a variety of new curricula which were implemented in schools across the country including Philadelphia's elementary schools. Programs like SMSG, Madison Math, and Greater Cleveland sought to upgrade mathematics instruction and, hopefully, student understanding and achievement by providing particular approaches, materials, and staff development. Though most of the mathematics programs dealt with certain basic topics; e.g., sets, number and operations concepts, mathematical reasoning, different schools adopted different programs; and individual teachers, as a result of specialized training, became on-site experts in one or the other of these programs.

Generally, the same kind of curriculum change took place in the physical and social sciences. Brandwein (1965) described elementary school science as inquiry-centered, with student and teacher actively engaged in the search for meaning. Science: a Process Approach (1965) and the Science Curriculum Improvement Study (Karplus and Thier, 1967) are examples of programs which aimed at updating and redirecting elementary school science instruction. In some cases, the new science program actually introduced science as a separate subject into the elementary school for the first time in years.

New social sciences projects were typically based on essential concepts and generalizations; e.g., social institutions provide the means for accomplishing group values. (Michaelis, et. al., 1967). Student attitudes, behaviors, and intellectual abilities related to identification and understanding of these concepts and generalizations were specified. Teacher training and material development assisted in

implementation of programs like Taba's Contra Costa curriculum (1965) and Man: A Course of Study (Bruner, 1966). But in these social sciences projects just as in the mathematics and physical science programs, the teacher who was trained to accomplish classroom implementation was not likely trained to implement a new curriculum in another of the disciplines. (This was a result of attempting to get as many teachers as possible involved in new programs and also based, wherever possible, on teacher interest.) Thus, it was possible for an elementary school classroom to reflect a new program and approach to mathematics instruction with transfer to the other subject areas a hoped-for but relatively unplanned outcome. In practice, then, child-directed learning experiences in one subject were often followed by textbook, teacher-directed activities in the other subjects.

Kindergarten Education

The early childhood movement was exercising considerable influence during these years of elementary school curriculum revision. By 1965, for example, kindergarten was available to every child in Philadelphia from four years and seven months to five years and seven months of age. National figures indicated similar growing acceptance of programs for young children and by 1968, almost 77% of America's five-year-olds were enrolled in school programs (Nehrt and Hurd, 1969). While the objectives of instruction may have varied somewhat among teachers, Headley's (1965) statement of purpose was generally ascribed to:

Friendliness and helpfulness in relationships with other children

Greater power in problem solving based on group relationships and individual activities

Responsiveness to intellectual challenge

Achievement of effective sensory-motor coordination

Responsiveness to beauty (aesthetic development)

Understanding concepts necessary for continued learning

Realization of individuality (self-concept)

The typical kindergarten curriculum reflected these broad goals by emphasizing activities in creative expression (art, music, construction), language development (show and tell, discussion, story telling and listening), and free play. Our Children in Kindergarten (1960), the curriculum guide developed by teachers and supervisors in Philadelphia, defined its educational philosophy thusly:

> "The kindergarten holds a unique place in the field of education. Because it is free of subject matter requirements, it is able to build its program entirely upon the characteristics and needs of its children. The broad areas of the curriculum which are presented in this guide are those areas which all authorities agree are a part of the natural living of four and five-year-old children.... The kindergarten should not be considered merely a preparation for first grade. It has an essential place in the educational

system because it offers to four and five-year-old children the kind of education which is best suited to their needs and their level of maturity."

(Our Children in Kindergarten, pp. V-VII, 1960)

Therefore, while considerable change was evolving in the elementary grades based on revision of the subject curricula, kindergartens remained relatively free of emphasis on the disciplines. Robison and Spodek (1965) attempted to change course somewhat by recommending use of key ideas taken from analysis of the disciplines as the base for kindergarten curriculum. These ideas would gain meaning through appropriate classroom experiences including the already-mentioned language development and creative activities. This could provide a beginning for the learning of more complex principles and concepts. However, Ream's (1969) survey of more than 100 school districts across the country indicated that informal learning experiences still dominated kindergarten classrooms and that physical education and art activity occurred more frequently than language arts or reading instruction. It is hard to say how much these informal experiences had their roots in the disciplines. Whatever the quality, it was clear by the late sixties that battle lines were being drawn in the schools and in the communities between those who saw early childhood education as self-motivated, self-paced, experiential development and those who saw early childhood education as "enforcement from without" (Elkind, 1969). The Head Start program helped to further define this controversy.

Head Start and the War on Poverty

Head Start was introduced as part of another war, the national effort to minimize the devastating effects of poverty. While the curriculum revision movement aimed at improving instruction in mathematics, science, and other subjects, Head Start sought to compensate for the deprivations exhibited by poor pre-school children via implementation of a multi-service program. In the summer of 1965, more than a half-million children participated in the initial Head Start effort. (The School District of Philadelphia's Head Start program began that summer with responsibility delegated by the local anti-poverty agency. In the fall of 1965, year-round Head Start, called Get Set, was also introduced in Philadelphia to serve three and four-year-olds since older pre-schoolers had access to kindergarten. Summer Head Start was still maintained for those kindergarten-age children who for whatever reasons had not attended during the year and would be eligible for first grade in September. In 1969, problems with OEO support caused year-round Head Start in Philadelphia to become Get Set Day Care with funding from Title IV-A, Social Security Acts. About a year and a half later, OEO funding made it possible to reestablish the original Head Start program. Thus, in Philadelphia today, 7,000 pre-schoolers are enrolled in Get Set Day Care, year-round Head Start, and Summer Head Start. An additional 22,000 children attend kindergarten.)

From its inception, Head Start proclaimed allegiance to the Child Development concept of education. With health, nutritional, and social services and active engagement of parents in the program,

Head Start became a series of child development centers focusing on activity-and-experience-based learnings for children (most of Philadelphia's pre-school centers are housed in churches or other community facilities. Of the more than 130 such centers, only 19 are in schools). The typical day for a Head Start child turned out to be organized in much the same way as a kindergarten day with variations based on availability of additional staff and services, and the age of the children. Note the format recommended by a Head Start publication:

"Arrival, Independent Activity Period,
(Breakfast in Some Centers) 8:00-8:45

Work-Play Activity Period, including
Self-Directed Activities 8:45-10:00
Dramatic Play
Creative Experiences with Unstructured Media (e.g., painting, clay modeling, and waterplay)
Activities with Structured Media (e.g., games, puzzles, alphabet sets)
Informal Experiences in Language, Literature, Music

Transition (clean-up, snack) 10:00-10:15
Outdoor Work-Play 10:15-11:15
Clean-up 11:15-11:30
Lunch 11:30-12:30
Departure

P.M. Program (in All-day Centers)

A typical afternoon program includes a nap, outdoor play, and miscellaneous activities such as a cooking project, experiments with various classroom materials, book browsing, record listening, and game playing."

(Project Head Start, Pamphlet No. 11)

This framework permitted a reasonable amount of teacher flexibility. But again, as in kindergarten, program character had its roots in the traditional nursery school which had mainly served middle-class children. Major differences related to the level of attention given to the social, physical, and health problems of Head Start enrollees. The "whole child" actitude toward schooling had apparently achieved credibility.

The problems of evaluating the effectiveness of Head Start were quickly evident and are still with us. By 1968 for example, Omwake (1968) was already indicating that the goals of Head Start were changing. Whereas it was originally hoped that Head Start children would enter formal schooling with a greater sense of self-concept and personal motivation, more and more demands were being made on success as evidenced by achievement scores in standardized tests or the primary grades. It was becoming more and more difficult to seek skill development through experiential programming because parents and communities were insisting on results as defined by these same scores and grades even though parent attitudes toward Head Start

were generally positive. The Wolff and Stein (1967) study suggests mixed readings on program effectiveness with every indication that "washing out" occurred after time spent in kindergarten. The Westinghouse study (1969) reported some success in cognitive development for some children but little success in affective development. Other studies (Evans, 1971) suggest more optimistic findings with the general conclusion that a brief pre-school experience could not nearly compensate for the effects of poverty and deprivation.

Follow Through

The Follow Through program was established to "sustain and supplement in the early years the gains made by low-income children who have had a full year's experience in a Head Start or comparable pre-school program" (Follow Through Program Manual, p.1, 1969). In the fall of 1968, after some months of planning, Philadelphia began its project in sixteen schools with 1,343 kindergarten pupils. The schools were selected primarily on the basis of school and community interest and receptivity and enough available space to allow for smaller class size over a period of years. In addition there needed to be enough pre-school centers in the school-community to fulfill the Head Start-Follow Through continuum requirement. At the present time, approximately 7,000 children from kindergarten through the third grade are being served in eighteen schools. (Two new schools entered the program in Sepember, 1969.) This represents about 10% of the total Follow Through population in all fifty states. One of

the reasons the Office of Education has been able to make this commitment to Philadelphia is the School District's continued willingness to match Economic Opportunity Act monies with significant allocations of local Title I funds. From February, 1968 through August, 1973, EOA has awarded grants amounting to $9,250,000 for Philadelphia's Follow Through program which have been matched by local allocations of $10,700,000 from Title I. It should be noted that Title I support of Follow Through has been progressively increased in Philadelphia to the point where the 1972-73 ratio is two dollars of Title I for one dollar of EOA. Included in these program costs are expenditures for three summer programs for 2,300 Follow Through children, local training centers for two program models, research activities, and central administration. Additional local share has been made up through costs of space, maintenance, and general overhead services, e.g., payroll, personnel, finance, etc.

By 1968, Philadelphia had already been involved in a variety of projects related to the curriculum reform movement in elementary schools. Madison Math, Elementary Science Study, Science: A Process Approach are examples of new curricula which were being implemented in schools across the city. Teachers had been trained to organize classrooms differently and use new materials and teaching procedures. But, as noted earlier, the likelihood was that an individual teacher was only engaged in an innovation concerned with a particular subject area.

The early childhood emphasis was also evident in the Get Set and Head Start programs and city-wide kindergarten enrollment. (Kindergarten is not mandated by the State of Pennsylvania.) The School District declared early childhood education a priority of the system and, in Spring of 1969, the Office of Early Childhood Programs was created to manage and coordinate existing effort, generate new programs and services, and, in general, to serve as an advocate on behalf of young children and their families.

Excerpts from the resolution passed by the Board of Education which formally approved Philadelphia's involvement in Follow Through provide some indications of the School District's hopes for the program:

"RESOLVED, That the following named early childhood education model and supplementary programs be authorized for use in the Philadelphia Public Schools Follow Through Project...

1. Bank Street College of Education Model,
   Bank Street College, New York, N.Y.

2. Behavior Analysis Model,
   University of Kansas,
   Department of Human Development,
   Lawrence, Kansas

3. Bilingual-Bicultural Model,
   Southwest Educational Development Laboratory,
   Austin, Texas

4. Education Development Center
   Newton, Massachusetts

5. Florida Parent Education Model,
   University of Florida
   College of Education,
   Institute for Development of Human Resources,
   Gainesville, Florida

6. Parent Implemented Model,
   Harrison School
   Philadelphia, Pa.

7. Philadelphia Process Approach Model,
   Philadelphia, Pa.

.... Philadelphia was invited by the U. S. Office of Education to participate in a four year research design in a service setting, known nationally as Follow Through. Follow Through is an attempt to implement, on a nationwide scale, 1) effective, exemplary approaches to the education and development of young children and 2) methods of instituting change and innovation in existing school systems. This is a program designed to build upon and augment in the early years the gains children have made in Get Set Day Care or other pre-school programs.

Advantages common to all models are:

1. One teacher for each 25 children at the kindergarten level and one teacher for each 30 children at Year 1 to Year 3 levels.
2. At least one full time aide for each teacher.
3. Daily hot lunch and nutritional education.
4. Staff training and materials development work for teachers, aides and parents by resource persons within each model.
5. Local supportive services by on-site team leaders, social workers, school community coordinators and psychologists.
6. Utilization of existing school services and facilities implied in the term "maintenance of effort".

7. Supplemental medical, dental and mental health services.

8. An ongoing commitment to marshall the resources of the school, community and family in a comprehensive program to meet the child's educational, physical and psychosocial needs.

9. Active parent participation in planning and operation, including fifty percent representation on every Policy Advisory Committee; a PAC functions on each site.

10. Involvement and representation of community agencies as well as staff and parents in advisory committees.

11. A four hour extended school day for kindergarten children and a state mandated day for children at the remaining grade levels.

12. A local model coordinator serving in a leadership support role.

Even though all models share these commonalities, there are distinctive features in each model. In this diversity among models and in the consistency of treatment within each model it is hoped that the value of specific components will be identified and cost effectiveness determined."

(School District of Philadelphia Board of Education Resolution, September 1968)

Thus, the School District committed itself not only to participation in a major research effort related to early childhood education models but also to effecting significant change in the "system". The many ramifications of this latter goal have been continually clarified as program implementation occurred. In addition to the implications of model commonalities as described above, the most immediate change took place in kindergarten education. Planned variation meant new approaches in kindergarten, approaches based on differing theories and philosophies. But perhaps even more important, it meant that different schools and communities through partnership with the model sponsors began to view themselves as implementors and eventually proponents of a series of program models. A sub-system has emerged, made up of eighteen schools linked together as much by their variety as by their similarity.

The partnership between sponsor and school-community has been critical to program development and, particularly, in the early stages, there were many problems. A descriptive report issued by Philadelphia's Research Office stated:

> ".... The first year of the program witnessed many of the difficulties inherent in an attempt to plant innovative methods into a well established institution. The beginnings of the program found personnel resistant to change, hazy about what changes they were actually expected to bring about, and anxious about the outcomes. In many cases the philosophy and techniques appropriate to each model had to be learned on the job, since it was not known

ahead of the school year which teachers were to participate in the program.

The first year also witnessed limited contact with the model sponsors, no doubt due to the fact that they were busy building foundations too. At the local level, program implementation was the first order of business and little time was left to concentrate on such areas as supplementary health services and full community involvement. ..."

(Follow Through Report, p.iv, 1972)

What became somewhat obvious during that first year and even more clear later was that successful marriage requires considerable adjustment and adaptation by both partners and that more attention should have been paid earlier in Follow Through to identification of as many of these related concerns as possible. Eventually, a variety of mechanisms and procedures were developed to effect a happier amalgamation. By 1972, the following statement could be made:

"....Each year has brought about greater program refinement, better use of paraprofessionals, greater parental involvement, more interest and enthusiasm at all levels and a great deal of success in providing supplementary services. From a concentration on implementation at the instructional level, the program has been able to move more and more towards articulation. ..."

(Follow Through Report, p.v, 1972)

Interestingly enough the OE Follow Through Program Manual (1969) recognized the need for effective cooperation among all the agents influential to the child's development. Further, the manual suggested that this interaction might require "changes in established

ways of operating, organizing, or cooperating." It is unfortunate that minimum effort has been made to evaluate or document this crucial matter. Surely, each school system, each sponsor, each parent group has responded to the change issue in unique ways at specific times. The degree to which program implementation has occurred successfully in the eyes of these constituents has depended on the flexibility and immovability of varying forces. Traditional experimental design in the urban school context becomes an almost irrelevant issue unless documentation of institutional changes are considered critical to the evaluation.

The School District of Philadelphia has introduced a number of administrative procedures and modified others in order to effect Follow Through's development. Some of these procedures have become institutionalized. For example, prior to Follow Through, teacher aides were hired through a single centralized examination and listing which meant that aides could be assigned anywhere in the city regardless of the neighborhood in which they lived. This did not take into consideration extensive travel time, child care needs, status and role in one's own community and with one's own children, and familiarity and identity with the children to be served. Follow Through's emphasis on parent and community involvement rendered this procedure inappropriate. Therefore, examinations for paraprofessionals were decentralized so that Follow Through aides would be appointed to schools in their own communities. This policy has now been generalized to the rest of the system.

Another personnel change related to professional roles in Follow Through. Staff training was obviously critical to the sponsors and it was soon evident that each model had unique staff training needs. Eventually, all the sponsors had the opportunity to participate in the development of job descriptions within the context of Philadelphia's personnel policies. Some sample job titles and descriptive excerpts follow (note the delineation of program philosophy and/or theory as part of the announcements):

"Staff Developer - Bank Street Model

Work includes training professionals and paraprofessional classroom personnel and parents to function as effective working teams to develop each child's capacity to become a self-directed, independent learner...."

"Staff Trainer - Behavior Analysis Model

Staff Trainer is responsible for the training of professional, paraprofessional, and volunteer classroom personnel in the philosophy and practices of the Behavior Analysis Model of Follow Through including the use of token systems and curriculum materials, and the individual application of behavior analysis techniques...."

"EDC Local Advisor

...the EDC Local Advisor coordinates the roles of parents, teachers, and administrators, and the model sponsor in achieving model objectives of expanding and developing areas of learning inside and outside the classroom...."

The people performing these kinds of tasks across all models have proved their capability through training and selection. Thus, local leadership has been developed and collaborates with the sponsor in the translation of model goals and practices.

In addition to these and other personnel policy modifications, practices have been adjusted in administrative support areas; e.g., purchasing, accounting, and payroll. These changes have sometimes demanded interesting confrontations. For example, when School District fiscal policies made it difficult for monies to flow easily into certain parent participation activities, meetings were held to enable the parents to voice their concerns directly to financial officers instead of via Follow Through staff. The result was a compromise in District policies with an agreement by the parents assuring accountability of expenditures.

Parent participation and community involvement have played major roles in all aspects of the program. Each school has a Policy Advisory Committee which participates actively with staff and sponsor in basic decision-making about budget, staffing and program implementation. Representatives of these parent groups sit on screening committees in the hiring of new personnel. Parents have been trained in model theory and procedures in order to serve more effectively as volunteers and paraprofessionals. Some of the models utilize a parent scholarship approach which provides parents with training as well as money to defray costs of baby sitting and other expenses. Many of these parents are now able to work with staff in conducting neighborhood workshops in early childhood education. One provocative outcome of this high degree of participation has been an equally high degree of support for program

model and school. Follow Through parents are concerned about standardized test scores but they appear more concerned about the quality and comprehensiveness of all program services and the overall effects on their children. In March, 1973 a presentation about Follow Through was made at a meeting of the Board of Education which was televised on the local public television channel. A Follow Through parent made the following statement at that meeting:

"I am Marie Coursey, a Follow Through parent and a parent of three children who did not have the advantage of Follow Through. My youngest child started kindergarten in September, 1970 and since that day he and I have been going to school together.

"When my other children started school I went with them too but only as far as the school yard. Parents were not welcomed in the school unless you were asked to come. To me this is one of the most important features about Follow Through. It is a great feeling to be able to spend the day with my child and all of the children in the classroom, to see how they are learning, how creative they are and watch. The way all the children welcome the parents into the school. I have three older children and not only has Follow Through been a great learning experience for my child, but it has been a great learning experience for me--taking advantage of some of the workshops on child behavior and learning how to help my child with His emotional feelings, and things like taking him to the supermarket, letting him pick out things that he would like,

telling him the price of them, letting him count the stacks of boxes and those sort of things. There have been reading workshops, making games--just learning such a simple thing as talking with your child--it brings a sort of closeness between parents and children. With my older children there was more stress on discipline and less stress on the child's feelings and openness--being able to express themselves.

"If Follow Through had been available at the time when my older children were going to school, maybe they would have been happier, because Follow Through children are happy going to school, and that's important."

(Report to the Board of Education - Follow Through, March 1973)

Variations in services other than instruction have helped to influence the larger system. Each Follow Through school has had the opportunity to identify and select those agencies and resources most able to meet the needs of the specific school-community so that there are now different patterns for delivery of health, social, and psychological services. The Presbyterian-University of Pennsylvania Medical Center supplies comprehensive medical services to all Follow Through children in three West Philadelphia schools. The Center has also agreed contractually that parents shall have regular appointments and continuing service from the same physician, thus minimizing the clinic-type relationship. St. Christopher's Hospital serves five schools in North Philadelphia by delivering a variety of health services including parent education related to community health needs. Temple University's Department of School Psychology has furnished a system of screening and evaluative activities and consultative assistance to

teachers. It is important to note that each community agency which has engaged in Follow Through service has needed to make adjustments in its own procedures in order to satisfy special program needs and the desires of staff and community.

The Follow Through program plays a major role in Philadelphia's total early childhood effort and has already contributed to the development of other programs. A Title III-funded dissemination and training project was mounted for parents and teachers not involved in Follow Through or other innovative early childhood programs. Now in its second year, this project includes forty-five public and thirty-five archdiocesan elementary schools in a network of workshops, school visits, and training sessions. Certain of these schools have already begun to make changes in their kindergarten and primary grade programs as a result of parent and staff involvement. The year-round Head Start program has programmatically attached various of its centers to Follow Through schools, and some sponsors are training Head Start staff in downward extension of model procedures. One of the models (EDC) conducts a local advisory center which is a hub for the development of instructional materials and techniques to be used in Follow Through and non-Follow Through classrooms.

Follow Through Evaluation

Follow Through was established to maintain and reinforce the gains made by low-income children in pre-school programs. Clearly, comprehensive services were required to help achieve this goal. Planned variation, as the essential aspect of the instructional component, provided an enormous research and evaluation opportunity in the unlaboratory-like setting of public schools in poor communities. Unfortunately, not enough advantage has been made of the opportunity. The following issues are among the most crucial to a large city school system in defining why more has not been accomplished:

1. A great deal of time, energy, and commitment has gone into the delivery of services other than instruction. Yet we know too little about the development of these delivery systems or their effects. Even though non-instructional service was not varied systematically, it is evident that variations have, in fact, been produced and we need to document these variations, and to know more about costs, efficiency, relationship to child needs and development, and effects of new inter-agency relationships.

2. The term, planned variation, suggests a static quality about the infusion of different approaches to early childhood education into the school system. Actually, the process is dynamic and developmental. While overall philosophies may remain constant, operationalizing of philosophies has entailed redefinition of procedures, relationships, and curriculum materials. Attempts to determine effects on children via yearly standardized tests must be questioned in light of

this and other concerns. The danger of regular testing is that without enough other information about program development and impact, test results will call the tune prematurely.

3. Testing is also a serious problem as related to model differences. Philadelphia is implementing seven models:

A. Bank Street - stresses learning of basic skills in a classroom environment which places equal importance on social and emotional development; building positive self-image is a primary goal; children's interest and experiences form base for instructional activities with teacher serving as diagnostician and guide.

B. Behavior Analysis - uses a token exchange system for appropriate reinforcement of desired behavior; instructional objectives are carefully defined for the accomplishment of social and academic skills with emphasis on reading, mathematics, and handwriting.

C. Education Development Center (EDC) - draws its inspiration from the open education character of British Infant Schools; children assume primary responsibility for integrating their learning experiences with teacher guidance in a classroom organized into multi-material learning centers; concept development is seen as framework for skill development.

D. Florida Parent Education - focuses on educating parents for participation in their children's education and organization of the home environment to expand learning opportunities; curriculum and instructional activities are the result of parent-teacher and home-school interaction.

E. Language Development-Bilingual Education - stresses language as critical to affective and cognitive development; classroom activities are geared to unique needs of Spanish-speaking children and teaches all children to speak, read, and write in both their native and second languages.

F. Parent Implementation - emphasizes parent and community leadership in determining educational directions; parents choose the curriculum model and serve as volunteers, aides, tutors, and community organizers; the Philadelphia Process approach was selected in Philadelphia.

G. Philadelphia Process - a locally developed program which utilizes Science: A Process Approach as core for the development of curriculum materials in language arts, mathematics, and social studies; the goal is inquiring, independent learners who become increasingly sophisticated in observing, measuring, classifying, and predicting.

This spectrum of models synthesizes a major national valuation issue. All the sponsors agree that children will eventually achieve in the basic skills, particularly reading and mathematics. But there are differences in approach, timing, and emphasis. Further, each model did not start from the same point in terms of readiness for installation. Though there is considerable overlap and, in some cases, continued vagueness of definition, each of the models has been treated as a separate theory. Cross-sponsor testing without adequate documentation of these realities has provided only minimal information. In

addition, the administration of academic achievement tests to the relative exclusion of other measures has caused social and affective outcomes to appear less important. Interestingly enough, as noted earlier, the growing outcry for improved reading and mathematics scores has not yet diminished parent support in Philadelphia for those models which emphasize affect.

4. Evaluation should provide information useful for decision-making. But nationally collected data may be only minimally useful for the purposes of local action. Questions about Philadelphia's Follow Through program need to be answered in terms of those factors considered relevant and unique to Philadelphia. This does not eliminate the need for national evaluation. Rather, it suggests identification of those questions more appropriately dealt with at the national or local level.

Follow Through administration in the Office of Education recognized this concern and made it possible for Philadelphia to conduct some of its own studies. Recently, for example, a report was issued entitled Continuance and Transience Among Teachers and Pupils in the Follow Through Program in Philadelphia, 1968-1972 (1972). Teacher and pupil mobility has long been a concern in the city, particularly in schools serving poor children. It was most important, therefore, when this study indicated that over a four year period there was a 76% holding power for Follow Through teachers. (Of 309 teachers assigned to the program during this time, only 75 were no longer with the project in April, 1972.) In addition, after applying various exposure

criteria, it was found that 70% of the pupils had continued through 1972. Moreover, pupils with Head Start or similar pre-school experience continued at an even higher rate of almost 75%.

Communities which have necessary resources should be encouraged to gather such data in addition to obtaining other locally significant information. It is assumed that a national evaluation staff could provide necessary guidelines and technical assistance and, in general, organize and coordinate these local efforts. The result might be a more manageable and comprehensive national evaluation which integrates the findings of local, national, and sponsor studies.

5. The assessment of cost effectiveness has become a most critical need. Management decisions regarding expansion or cutbacks must indicate relationships between program costs, services, and outcomes. The difficulties in making these judgements are many but far more needs to be done about this matter than has been accomplished until now.

The Future

1. Follow Through has already provided considerable service to thousands of children and their families. It is apparent that more needs to be known about the delivery, efficiency and results of these services. Coleman (1973) has posited that in the world of action research results serve policy purposes so that regular accumulation of findings are preferable to the "single grand report". Quasi-experiments which operate in the urban crucible demand this approach.

2. Planned variation has helped to open the system to alternative programs and procedures. But feedback about results has lagged seriously. This must be corrected. Further, we need more information about how to determine what works best for whom and under what circumstances. The research art demands as much creativity and innovation as early learning programs or curriculum reform in order to help answer this question.

3. Planned variations must be well-enough defined so that expectations regarding teacher and child behaviors are understood. Programs that require more development should be so identified and given this opportunity without premature comparisons.

4. Findings need to be used for replication of successful elements and for the building of further experiments. Refinement could result in synthesis of components of various models. Appropriate dissemination strategies should be developed as part of this process.

5. Implementation of variations should be more directly related to the characteristics and needs of the community. Certain social service and curricular approaches may be more appropriately matched with localities in order to respond to local policy questions.

6. The role of school administrators, particularly principals, has proved critical to program implementation. Far more training should be available to help principals manage a planned variation. As leaders and proponents, they can eventually play a much greater part in program development and evaluation.

In summary, planned variation should be able to help answer many of the questions that beset an urban school system. Follow Through has made important strides in that direction.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brandwein, Paul F. Substance, Structure and Style in the Teaching of Science. New York: Harcourt Bruce, 1965.

Broudy, Harry S. Building a Philosophy of Education. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1954.

Bruner, Jerome. The Process of Education. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard, 1960.

Coleman, James. In Report on Education Research, Washington, D.C.: Jan. 17, 1973, 5, 5-6.

Continuance and Transience Among Teachers and Pupils in the Follow Through Program in Philadelphia, 1968-1972. Philadelphia: Office of Research and Evaluation, School District of Philadelphia, 1972.

Elkind, David. "Pre-School Education: Enrichment or Instruction?," Childhood Education, 1969, 46, 321-328.

Follow Through Program Manual. Washington: Office of Education, 1969.

Follow Through Report. Philadelphia: Office of Research and Evaluation, School District of Philadelphia, 1972

Foshay, Arthur W. "A Modest Proposal for the Improvement of Education," Educational Leadership, May 1961, 18, 500-514.

Headley, Neith. The Kindergarten: Its Place in the Program of Education. New York: Center for Applied Research in Education, 1965.

Karplus, Robert, and Their, Herbert D. The Science Curriculum Improvement Study. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1967.

Heath, Robert W. (Ed.) New Curricula. New York: Harper, 1964.

Michaelis, John U., Grossman, Ruth H., and Scott, Lloyd F. New Designs for the Elementary School Curriculum. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Nehrt, Roy C., and Hurd, Gordon E. Preprimary Enrollment of Children Under Six: October 1968. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, June 1969.

Omwake, Eveline. "Head Start - Measurable and Immeasurable." In Jerome Hellmuth (Ed.) Disadvantaged Child. Seattle: Special Child Publications, 1968, 2, 535-544.

Our Children in Kindergarten. Philadelphia: School District of Philadelphia, 1960.

Phenix, Philip H. Realms of Meaning. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.

Ream, Marsha A. Kindergarten Education in Public Schools, 1967-68. Washington, D.C.: Research Division - National Education Association, 1969.

Robison, Helen, and Spodek, Bernard. New Directions in the Kindergarten. New York: Teachers College Press, 1965.

Science: A Process Approach. Washington, D.C.: American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1965.

Taba, Hilda, and Hills, James L. Teacher Handbook for Contra Costa Social Studies, Grades 1-6. San Francisco: San Francisco State College, 1965.